

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 14, 15, 17, 19-27, 31, and 33-36 are pending.

Tina Lessani (Applicant's Attorney) and Mark Schoenhals (the inventor) had an interview with Examiner Moran of February 12, 2009. Applicant and Applicant's attorney thank the Examiner for the Interview. Independent claims 1, 19, and 23 were discussed. As the Examiner is new to the case, the purpose of the Interview was to give the Examiner an overview of the invention. The art cited by the previous Examiner in the previous Office Action was also discussed. Specifically Applicant explained that neither Graham nor Dutton discloses correlating a user's use of a website with a subsequent, independent call to a customer service agent. The Examiner stated that he would review the claims and art in view of his new understanding of the invention.

In Paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the previous Examiner stated that she did not give the recitation "where the phone call is made independent of the website" patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. Applicants respectfully submit that it is not necessary to give such recitation patentable weight to distinguish claims 1 and 23 over the cited art. Such recitation merely provides context for the invention.¹

In Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the previous Examiner stated that she disagrees with Applicant's argument that Dutton does not teach "displaying a unique ID to the user in a webpage." This statement is contrary to the Examiner's statement later in the Office Action that "Dutton does not explicitly teach: transmitting a webpage to the user that visibly displays a unique ID." (Page 4 of Office Action). Nevertheless, in paragraph 4, the previous Examiner references paragraphs 0032 and 0035-0036 as

¹ For avoidance of doubt, a user can retrieve a phone number from a website and still make a call that is independent of the website (*i.e.*, not made through the website).

support that Dutton teaches displaying a unique ID to the user in a webpage. These paragraphs in Dutton are related to recording and playing back a web session. Dutton saves webpages viewed by a user so that the user's web session can later be played back.

Specifically, in paragraph 0032, Dutton merely discloses that each webpage captured is assigned a unique page ID. This is not a unique ID that is displayed to a user. Rather, it is used by the backend system in Dutton to save and retrieve webpages in database 145 (see Figures 1a and 1b). For example, the first webpage a user view may be assigned ID "record/xxx/147.html," the second one ID "record/xxx/147.attr," the third one "record/xxx/148.html" and so on. Then, if the system needs to play a web session with the first and third pages a user viewed, then the system will retrieve the webpages with unique IDs "record/xxx/147.html" and "record/xxx/148.html" from the database.

With respect to the statement "the data may be displayed, for example, in a search frame for the web server or the browser" in paragraphs 0035—0036 of Dutton, the "data" that Dutton refers to here appears to be the user's web session (*e.g.*, the web pages viewed by the user), not the unique Page ID assigned each captured page. In other words, Dutton is referring to the playback of the recorded web session.

In paragraph 0028, Dutton discloses assigning a unique machine ID to a web browser, but this is nothing more than the well-known concept of transmitting a "cookie" to a web browser and storing a record of the cookie. The cookie is not visible to the user.

The previous Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 14, 15, 17, 19-27, 31, and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutton (2006/0200832) in view of Graham (20050038893). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites:

A method for correlating a user's use of a website with a user's phone call to a customer service agent for a business, where the phone call to the customer service agent is made independent of the website, the method comprising:

for each user that accesses the website, *transmitting a webpage to the user that visibly displays a unique ID, where the unique ID is unique to the user's web browser, and the where the unique ID is generated without obtaining information that identifies the user personally;*

storing a record of the unique IDs that have been displayed to users in a webpage;

in response to a user telephoning a customer service agent for the business, obtaining the user's unique ID from the user; and

correlating the user's call to the customer service agent with the users' use of the website using the user's unique ID. (Emphasis added).

The present invention enables a user's use of a website to be correlated with a user's subsequent telephone call to a customer service agent. Such correlation is useful in tracking the effect of advertising efforts. For example, if a company pays for a link to its website on a search engine site, such as Google or Yahoo, it is desirable for the company to know the percentage of its customers that used that link to subsequently purchase a product. Such information is relatively easy to track if the customer purchases a product on a company's website after using an advertised link. However, prior to the present invention, such information was lost if, after viewing the website, the customer elected to purchase the product through a different channel, such as the telephone network. The invention also is useful in helping customer service agents answering

customer phone calls to cross-sell products in that the customer service agent can see what products the user viewed on the website.

Neither Dutton nor Graham disclose correlating a user's use of a website with a subsequent call to a customer service agent using a unique ID that is visibly displayed to a user in a website.

Dutton is related to the playback of web sessions or audio recordings.

Specifically, discloses a method that enables a user to locate recorded data associated with events [0009]. Specifically, Dutton defines a set of "events" within a communication session with a server. Each event is assigned an event identifier (*e.g.*, a time stamp or a unique ID assigned a webpage), and the recorded data is displayed to the user as a list of events. A user then can select an event for playback/retrieval by selecting the event identifier for the event. In Dutton, the event identifier/unique ID is not used to correlate use of a website with a subsequent phone call to a customer service agent. Rather, as stated above, it is used to identify and retrieve/playback a portion of recorded data (such as a portion of a recorded conversation, or portions of a browser session). (See paragraph [0010] and claim 1.)

The previous Examiner cites Graham as disclosing "transmitting a webpage to a user that visibly displays a unique ID" and "correlating the user's call to a customer service agent with a user's use of a website using a user's unique ID." However, Applicant respectfully submits that this is not what Graham teaches. Graham is related to an ad delivery system, and Graham discloses a method for identifying the best advertisement to deliver to a user. Specifically, Graham discloses a method for (a) using communications between a user and a system to generate a user profile (see third

sentence of Abstract, paragraph [0041] and Figure 3); (b) using communications associated with users that have responded to an offer to generate an offer profile for an offer (see second sentence of Abstract, paragraph [0038] and Figure 2); and (c) comparing a user profile with offer profiles to identify the offer that is likely to be the most relevant to the user (see first paragraph of Abstract, paragraph [0042], and Figure 4). In other words, the Graham system looks at a user's profile and an offer's profile to identify the offer that is best suited for the user.

The previous Examiner cites paragraphs [0030]-[0031] in Graham as disclosing "transmitting a webpage to a user that visibly displays a unique ID." However, in these paragraphs, Graham discloses that an ad server may associate an "offer ID" with an advertisement. An offer ID is used by the ad delivery system in Graham to store and retrieve advertisements, and it not displayed to a user. Also, each user can have a user ID, but this something provided by a user, along with a password, to login to restricted website (see paragraph 0036).

Dependent claims 2-7, 14, 15, 17, are 33-34 are patentably distinguishable over Dutton and Graham for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 19-22 and 35-36 include the limitations "for each user that accesses the website, transmitting a webpage to the user that visibly displays a unique ID, where the unique ID is unique to the user's web browser and where the unique ID is generated without obtaining information that identifies the user personally" and "correlating such user's call to the customer service agent with user use of the website by correlating records from each of the website and customer service agent call center using the unique

IDs.” For the reason discussed above, neither Dutton nor Graham discloses these limitations.

Claims 23-27 and 31 include the limitations “a web server for the website that transmits a web page that visibly displays a unique ID to each user that accesses the website, where, for each user, the unique ID is unique to the user’s web browser, and unique ID is generated without obtaining information that identifies the user personally” and “an analyzer that correlates users’ calls to a customer service agent with users’ use of the website by correlating records in the first and second databases associated with matching unique IDs.” For the reasons discussed above, neither Dutton nor Graham discloses these limitations.

Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

MARK D. SCHOENHALS

Dated: March 16, 2009

By: Tina M. Lessani

Tina M. Lessani
Lessani & Lessani LLP
163 Cypress Point Road
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
Tel: (650) 712-0420
Fax: (650) 712-0449